UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,476	01/27/2004	Koji Shimizu	118245	9140

25944 7590 08/29/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER	
AMADIZ, RODNEY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,476	SHIMIZU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RODNEY AMADIZ	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 July 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,057,589—hereinafter "Shin") in view of Watanabe.

As to **Claim 9**, Shin teaches an electro-optical device comprising: scanning lines ***(Fig. 4, X1-XM)***; data lines ***(D1-Dn)***; pixels arranged corresponding to intersections between the scanning lines and the data lines to form a matrix ***(210 and 212)***; selection-signal input terminals arranged close together ***(Fig. 5, at the far left, note the three nodes at the intersections of lines 241, 243 and 245 with the lines going into MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively)***, each selection-signal input terminals being supplied with a selection signal ***(Fig. 5, HR, HG and HB)***; image-signal input terminals being supplied with image-signals ***(Fig. 5, D1)***, the selection-signal input terminals and the image-signal input terminals being aligned along the same edge of the matrix ***(See Figs. 4 and 5, reference number 240)***; a selecting circuit ***(Fig. 4, 240)*** selectively supplying image signals to the data lines on the basis of the selection signals ***(See Fig. 5, wherein data signal D1 is supplied to Y1, Y2 and Y3 on the basis of the selection signals (241, 243 and 245) and Col. 7, lines 9-41)***, and the selecting circuit including switching elements ***(Fig. 5, MR1, MG1 and MB1)*** having first input-output terminals connected to

the data lines ***(Fig. 5, note connection to Y1, Y2 and Y3)***, second input-output terminals connected to a node supplying the image signals ***(Fig. 5, note connection to D1 through node)***, and control input terminals to which the selection signals are supplied ***(Fig. 5, note connections from 241, 243 and 245 to MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively)***; and a selection-signal supplying device to supply the selection signals to the selection-signal input terminals, and selection-signals supplying lines, ***(Fig. 5, note signals HR, HG and HB coming from controller (not shown)—Col. 7, lines 9-41)***, each of the selection-signal supplying lines including a first wiring line extending from the selection-signal input terminal in a same direction as the direction as the direction in which the data lines extend, and extending in a direction intersecting the direction in which the data lines extend ***(Fig. 5, (left side) note the intersection of lines 241, 243 and 245 with the first wiring lines that extend downwards in the direction of the data lines and then to the right (in a direction intersecting the direction of the data lines) towards MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively)***; the control input terminals of the selection circuits being arranged in the same direction as that of the selection-signal input terminals and in the same order as the corresponding selection-signal input terminals ***(See Fig. 5)***.

Shin fails to teach a second wiring line extending from the first wiring line to the control input terminal in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend. However, the specification shows no apparent benefits from having a second wiring line extend from the first wiring line to the control input in a same direction as the direction in which the data lines extend. Therefore, having a second wiring line extend in specific

directions is clearly a design choice based on the specific requirement of the claim. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a second wiring line to the electro-optical device taught by Shin and extend it in any direction since extending the wiring lines in any direction would perform equally well at carrying and providing the intended signal.

Shin additionally fails to teach all of the signal-supplying lines having the same length and width from the corresponding selective-signal input terminal, through a portion of the first wiring and through the second wiring line, to the control input terminal of the corresponding switching element to compose an equivalent low-pass filter. Examiner cites Watanabe to teach that the concept of having wiring lines of the same length and width is well known ***(Col. 6, lines 45-48)***. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Watanabe (i.e. make wiring lines with the same length and width) in the electro-optical device taught by Shin so that each signal-supplying line, from the selective-signal input terminal to the control input terminal, may be equal in load capacitance ***(Col. 6, lines 45-48)***. The resulting combination of Shin and Watanabe yields an equivalent low-pass filter.

As to **Claim 11**, Shin, as modified by Watanabe, teaches an electronic apparatus comprising the electro-optical device of Claim 9 ***(Shin—See Fig. 4)***.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed July 10, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the direction of the selection-signal input terminals, the selection-signal supplying lines and the control input terminals, with respect to the data lines, are different than the direction of those elements taught in Shin. The Examiner respectfully disagrees (see rejection above). Even if Shin taught that the directions of these elements were different, with respect to the elements in the instant application, the Examiner respectfully submits that this is not a patentable distinction but rather a design choice The specific arrangement of input terminals and signal lines does not provide an improvement over the prior art since both Shin and the instant application function in providing an intended signal from point A to point B regardless of the arrangement of the signal lines and the input/output terminals. The Applicant also argues that the simple structure allows the formation of an equivalent low pass filter. The rejection above shows that Shin, as modified by Watanabe, has the same structure as the Applicant claims. Therefore, the resulting combination of Shin and Watanabe also yields a low pass filter. Furthermore, the Applicant has not submitted evidence as to how Shin and Watanabe would not perform as a low pass filter.

Conclusion

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 10, 2008 has been entered.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RODNEY AMADIZ whose telephone number is (571)272-7762. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/R. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
8/27/08